

UR 6829

Jan 30, 1953

135

1        (o) With respect to Point Conception Consolan Station,  
 2     Point Conception, California, under the heading "Continental  
 3     United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command"  
 4     in section 301, strike "\$72,000" and insert in lieu thereof  
 5     "\$232,000".

6        (p) In clause (3) of section 502 thereof delete the  
 7     amounts "\$389,125,000" and "\$398,954,000" and insert  
 8     in lieu thereof the amounts "\$405,176,000" and  
 9     "\$415,005,000", respectively.

10                    **TITLE IV**

11        SEC. 401. The Director of Central Intelligence is au-  
 12     thorized to provide for a headquarters installation for the  
 13     Central Intelligence Agency, in the District of Columbia  
 14     or elsewhere, by the acquisition of land at a cost of not  
 15     to exceed \$1,000,000, and construction of buildings, facil-  
 16     ities, appurtenances, utilities, and access roads at a cost of  
 17     not to exceed \$53,500,000, of which not more than  
 18     \$8,500,000 shall be available for transfer to the National  
 19     Capital Planning Commission and the Department of the  
 20     Interior for acquisition of land for and construction to  
 21     extend the George Washington Memorial Parkway to the  
 22     present site of the research station of the Bureau of Public  
 23     Roads at Langley, Fairfax County, Virginia: Provided, That  
 24     at such time as it is determined that construction of such  
 25     headquarters installation at said research station will

Document No. **44-58**  
 Review of this document by CIA has determined that

<input type="checkbox"/> CIA has no objection to release
<input type="checkbox"/> It contains information of CIA interest that must remain classified at TS
<input type="checkbox"/> Authority: H.R. 742 S
<input type="checkbox"/> It contains nothing of CIA interest

STAT

1   be commenced or continued, said amount of \$8,500,000,  
2   or the remainder thereof, shall no longer be available for  
3   obligation: Provided further, That at such time as the Central  
4   Intelligence Agency occupies the headquarters installation  
5   authorized by this title, the Administrator of General Services  
6   is authorized and directed to accomplish the demolition and  
7   removal of temporary Government building space in the Dis-  
8   trict of Columbia of equivalent occupancy to that relinquished  
9   by the Central Intelligence Agency.

10                    TITLE V

11                    GENERAL PROVISIONS

12        SEC. 501. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air  
13      Force are respectively authorized to proceed with the es-  
14      tablishment or development of military and naval installa-  
15      tions and facilities as authorized by titles I, II, and III of  
16      this Act, and the Director of Central Intelligence is author-  
17      ized to proceed with the establishment of a Central Intelli-  
18      gence Agency Headquarters Installation as authorized by  
19      title IV of this Act, without regard to the provisions of sec-  
20      tions 1136, 3648, and 3734, as respectively amended, of  
the Revised Statutes, and prior to approval of title to under-  
lying land, as provided by section 355, as amended, of the  
Revised Statutes. The authority under this Act of the Sec-  
retary of a military department to provide family housing

STAT

Senate Report No. 694

June 30, 1953

Approved For Release 2003/04/17 : CIA-RDP80A1370E000500060017-3  
14 AUTHORIZE CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

#### FORMULATION AND PRESENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

The committee has noted with pleasure the very substantial improvements in the composition and method of presentation to the Congress of the military public works programs. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations, his Director of Construction, and the military and civilian officials responsible for the presentation of this program in each of the three military departments have been impressive in their appearances before the committee.

During the forthcoming adjournment of the Congress and early in the next session, the committee intends to continue its conferences and formal hearings with these officials for the purposes of following the progress of the construction program, of examining cost experience, and of formulating judgment on future requirements.

#### LAND ACQUISITIONS

The committee has reluctantly approved the authorization in this bill for acquisition of additional land at several installations. While it is realized that the development of new weapons and aircraft has made some installations obsolete for the purposes that they must now serve, the inconvenience to the dislocated landowners and the tax consequences to local governments caused by continued land takings for military purposes are subjects of serious concern. The Department of Defense and the military departments are again urged to limit their land requirements to the absolute minimum that is consistent with their missions in the national defense, and to coordinate operations that require extensive land areas.

Under the provisions of title VI, Public Law 155, 82d Congress, the committee will have an additional opportunity to consider land acquisitions involving more than \$25,000 that are authorized in this bill. The acquisitions that are subject to this provision of law will again be carefully reviewed in the light of circumstances then existing when committee agreement is sought.

#### TITLE IV

This title of the bill would authorize the Director of Central Intelligence to construct a headquarters building, together with related facilities, appurtenances, utilities, and access roads at a cost not to exceed \$53,500,000.

This authorization has been included in the military construction bill since the Armed Services Committees have jurisdiction over matters of substantive legislation affecting the Central Intelligence Agency.

The CIA is presently located in 34 separate buildings in the District of Columbia area. The committee has been impressed by the increased efficiency and security that could be attained by providing centralized facilities, in addition to the monetary savings that will result.

The authorization request for the building proper was in the amount of \$50 million. The committee has reduced this request by \$5 million after considering the cost of construction and the size of similar buildings in the Washington area. Document No. \_\_\_\_\_

Review of this document by CIA has determined that

CIA has no objection to declass

It contains information of CIA interest that must remain

classified at TS S C

Authority: HR 70-2

Approved For Release 2003/04/17 : CIA-RDP80-01370R000500060017-3  
AUTHORIZE CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS 13

A Navy proposal to establish a new jet base in the vicinity of New Iberia, La., was the subject of painstaking deliberation by the committee. The land required as a site for this base is in possession of descendants of the Acadians and much of it has been held within the families for 200 years. Despite misgivings over disrupting such a tradition, the committee has been impressed by the efforts of the Navy to find another suitable location, without success. The essential factors in the selection of the New Iberia area were the soil conditions, the proximity to the Gulf of Mexico and gunnery ranges there, and the avoidance of airspace problems. Responsible Navy officials have assured the committee that the New Iberia site is the only one within the acceptable area that meets Navy requirements and on which the soil conditions are satisfactory enough to justify an expenditure of the magnitude that will be required for such a base. Consequently, the New Iberia location has been approved.

The Air Force authorization request includes an item for the construction of a headquarters building for the Air Research and Development Command. The headquarters is now located in the city of Baltimore, scattered among several buildings, none of which is adequate as a headquarters building. The Air Force proposes to locate the headquarters building at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio. The Secretary of the Air Force, the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Research and Development, and the head of the Air Research and Development Command testified that the Wright-Patterson location is the most desirable one. On the other hand, the committee considered the so-called Cook report, which was prepared earlier within the Department of the Air Force and which recommended Andrews Air Force Base as the site for headquarters of the Research and Development Command. The committee judgment is that a conclusive case has not been made for Wright-Patterson as the most advantageous location for this construction, although no doubt is entertained regarding the desirability of moving from the present unsatisfactory arrangements in Baltimore. Hence, the construction authorization for this purpose has been removed from Wright-Patterson, but left in the bill at a location to be determined. The committee believes that further study should be given to this selection, with particular weight being given to the dispersal problem and to earlier recommendations on this subject. It is expected that the appropriate congressional committees will be fully advised as to the results of this study before the Air Force proceeds to utilize this construction authorization.

RESERVE FACILITIES AT SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.

The need of existing units of the National Guard, both air and ground, the Army Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, Naval Surface Reserves, and the Marine Corps Reserve at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., for joint training and supporting facilities at the site of the municipal airport was brought to the attention of the committee. It appears that a great deal of valuable Government equipment and property is improperly housed and that training facilities are inadequate. The committee brings the matter to the attention of the Department of Defense for appropriate consideration under the provisions of the National Defense Facilities Act.

Selection of a site for this construction was the subject of careful committee inquiry. One of the proposed locations that is still a very likely possibility is on Government-owned land at Langley, Va. If this site is finally chosen, an extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from its present terminus approximately 3½ miles below Chain Bridge to the research station of the Bureau of Public Roads at Langley, Va., approximately 3½ miles above Chain Bridge, would be required. The bill includes authority to transfer \$8,500,000 to the National Capital Planning Commission and the Department of Interior for the acquisition of land and the construction of the extension of this parkway. If the Langley site is not selected, this \$8,500,000 would not be available for obligation. The original estimate of \$6 million for land acquisition at a site other than Langley has been reduced by the committee to \$1 million.

A proviso to this title calls for the demolition, at such time as the Central Intelligence Agency occupies the headquarters installation authorized by this title, of temporary space of "equivalent occupancy" to that now occupied by the Central Intelligence Agency in temporary buildings. It is expected that priority will be given to the demolition of the temporary buildings in the Mall area.

#### TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 501 provides the authority to acquire land on which to provide family housing for military personnel. It also contains the customary language avoiding the application of certain sections of the Revised Statutes that impose unreasonable restrictions on the prosecution of a military construction program under conditions prevailing today.

Section 502 authorizes the appropriation of funds to carry out the provisions of the bill.

Section 503 permits a reasonable flexibility in the costs of construction at individual installations. This section allows the station total to be exceeded by 5 percent at stations within the United States and by 10 percent at stations overseas, but any excess at individual stations must be compensated for by reductions within the title of the station involved.

Section 504 defines the specific construction authority so as to include incidental expenses such as those of administration, overhead, planning, and supervision.

Section 505 authorizes, in the case of foreign contracts, a modification of the rigid audit requirements of Public Law 245, 82d Congress. These requirements are difficult to apply in foreign countries because of the reluctance of foreign contractors to agree to compliance, and because of the lack of conformity of foreign accounting practices to American standards. This section is not new. Similar language has been included in all military construction acts since 1952.

Section 506 repeats, in substance, the provisions of a floor amendment to last year's military construction bill. This section provides that contracts entered into pursuant to the authorization contained in this bill shall be awarded on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the interest of the national security would not

be impaired thereby, and if such an award is consistent with the provisions of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947.

Section 507 amends section 407 of Public Law 765, 83d Congress, by increasing from \$25 million to \$100 million the authority to provide housing through use of the proceeds from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The revised section amends the provision with respect to the reimbursement of Commodity Credit Corporation and provides that the limitation of \$100 million shall apply to the amount of the expenditure of foreign currencies rather than to the value of the houses. This will enable the Department of Defense, in appropriate cases, to utilize troop labor without a reduction in the total of the authority to use proceeds from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities. The amendment will also provide a more realistic basis for the reimbursement of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It will enable the Department of Defense to cooperate and assist in the surplus agricultural commodities disposal program and to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation through payments that otherwise would be made to military personnel as rental allowances without increasing the Defense budget.

Section 508 reaffirms the existing limitations on the size of family housing. These limitations range from 1,080 square feet in the case of enlisted personnel to 2,100 square feet in the case of generals and flag officers. These limitations recognize that the size of housing provided should bear a reasonable relationship to the quarters allowances that would be paid to the personnel occupying the housing in case Government quarters were not available.

Section 509 has been added by the committee for the purpose of continuing unit-cost limitations on certain items of construction that are used by all the military departments, and for which there should be reasonably uniform designs and costs. Authority is granted the Secretary of Defense to waive the limitations in special circumstances, such as allowances for cost differentials between geographic areas.

Section 510 provides an initial step in canceling authorizations for construction which have been law for a number of years, but which have not been utilized by the military departments. Under this section, any authorization enacted prior to October 1, 1951, (with certain minor exceptions) as to which funds shall not have been obligated in whole or in part by July 1, 1956, will be canceled as of that date. In this connection, title IV contains an authorization for the construction of a headquarters installation for the Central Intelligence Agency which repeats, in an increased amount, a previous authorization intended for that purpose. The existing authorization to the CIA will not have been fully canceled until July 1, 1956. However, it is the intent of this committee that the authorization under title IV be in full substitution for the existing authorization. Section 510 will rescind \$602.4 million in authorizations no longer required that have already been identified, as well as an additional authorization totalling at least \$300 million which will be identifiable as the construction programs are carried to conclusion. It is anticipated that cancellation of prior unused authorizations will be extended in connection with future military public works authorization acts so that existing authorizations can be restricted to those that are in fact currently needed.

of Congress. It was not necessary to be a Member of Congress or a high ranking officer in order to be afforded an opportunity to appear and give testimony. It is entirely possible that some of the witnesses whom the committee heard were making their first visit to Washington. It can be said for the military departments concerned in each instance that they cooperated fully and indicated at no time any objection to the hearing of all sides of the question by the committee.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

While the Central Intelligence Agency is not a part of the Department of Defense, the military authorization bill was used this year as an appropriate vehicle for obtaining authority to construct a headquarters for it. Testimony was taken in closed session from the Director of Central Intelligence Agency, Hon. Allen W. Dulles, and his assistants. This testimony revealed that the situation in which that agency finds itself, being distributed as it is today in 34 different buildings, makes the need for a single integrated facility obvious.

FIFTH ARMY HEADQUARTERS

Fifth Army Headquarters is now located in Chicago, Ill. The belief has been expressed by some interested Members of Congress that this headquarters would be more appropriately located at the existing, but unused, Army facility at Fort Des Moines, Iowa. Secretary Stevens was queried concerning his views in this respect, and, while indicating that the location of the headquarters in the Chicago area was proper, assured the committee that he would make a prompt report of the situation and furnish advice as to his conclusions in this respect in the near future.

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

This bill contains a proposed authorization for the construction of 17,000 family housing units. It represents a continuation of a program initiated last year which the committee hopes will result within the next 4 or 5 years in providing proper family accommodations for all of those members of our Armed Forces who by law are eligible for such housing. There is no doubt that one of the most serious problems confronting our Armed Forces is the lack of family housing. There is a total gross requirement worldwide for 727,000 units of military family housing. This total is based on using the 1956 projected military personnel strength of almost 2,900,000 and applying to it the percentages of married men as developed from service experience.

Using this same basis, the requirement within the continental United States is 538,000 units. To meet this requirement, the military departments have available to them the following units:

Permanent public quarters	32,600
Navy rentals	17,000
Wherry units	7,800
Public Law 765 units	11,600
Total	140,000

Document No. Review of this document by CIA has determined that

CIA has no objection to disclosure

It contains information of CIA

Interest that must remain

classified at TS S O

Authority: MR 70-2

18 CONSTRUCTION FOR MILITARY DEPARTMENTS AND [REDACTED]

From the resulting deficit of 398,000 must be deducted the number of available privately owned dwellings estimated to be 218,000 units. Therefore the net deficit in the continental United States is 180,000 units, broken down into 53,000 for the Army, 37,000 for the Navy, and 90,000 for the Air Force.

In addition to the continental United States deficit of 180,000, there is a similar deficit of 11,000 in the Territories and possessions and 56,000 in foreign countries. The total deficit, worldwide, is therefore 247,000 units.

In the foregoing calculations do not include approximately 79,000 Government-owned units of temporary construction. These were originally designed for emergency wartime use and are inadequate in many respects, including quality and size. They should be replaced with permanent structures as part of the long-range program. These 79,000 units include 54,500 in the United States, 6,500 in Territories and possessions, and 18,000 in foreign countries.

In recent years the requirement has been augmented by the rapid increase in the size of our Armed Forces and the increase in marriage rates. Furthermore, adequate provision has not been made for replacement of deteriorated houses of wartime construction. The result is that the military personnel who are paid a monetary quarters allowance are forced to compete for housing in a highly competitive and inflationary civilian housing market. Much of such available housing has been inferior and high rental rates have been prevalent.

This does not mean that the Government has been unmindful of its obligation to meet this humane requirement. It has encouraged and assisted the civilian economy in providing housing through such statutory devices as the Wherry Act and other laws administered by the Federal agencies. These programs have been of substantial help in alleviating the shortage but they have fallen far short of meeting the total needs.

The family housing situation has grown so acute that it is imperative that a comprehensive program be inaugurated at this time. Such a program is needed not only as a significant morale factor, but also to end the costly practice of maintaining converted barracks and other temporary structures that have long since passed their period of useful economic life. It is also needed to lessen the drain upon the Treasury through the continued payment of quarters allowances to personnel who cannot be supplied with public quarters. During the past 3 fiscal years the amounts of quarters allowances paid in millions of dollars are as follows:

	1952	1953	1954
Army	456.3	524.1	506.8
Navy and Marine Corps	345.4	383.9	383.3
Air Force	331.6	414.5	394.1
Total	1,133.3	1,322.5	1,294.2

The real question at this time is not whether the Federal Government should provide housing, but how to put such a program into effect. The methods, in

STAT

## MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION

*CIA  
P. 536*

### HEARINGS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES UNITED STATES SENATE EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION ON **S. 1765 (H. R. 6829)**

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT  
MILITARY, NAVAL, AND AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS,  
AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

MAY 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 20, 23, 24, 25, JUNE 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 18, 14,  
23, 24, AND 27, 1955

Printed for the use of the Committee on Armed Services



Document No.

Review of this document by CIA has  
determined that

(1) It has no objection to declassification  
 (2) It contains information of CIA  
interest that must remain  
classified at **U.S. S C**  
Authority: **HR 10-2**

be using anyway. You have the replacement docks that you can throw in.

General LASHER. Delong piers.

Senator STENNIS. Are there any other facts now?

I believe if we can get the facts in the record, then we can weigh the thing the best we can and reach a decision. The facts are essential.

Senator JACKSON. I would like to have for the record the Coast Guard regulations with reference to Port Chicago and the extent to which they are now being violated.

Senator STENNIS. That is a very reasonable request and a pertinent matter.

Mr. FULLING. Captain Laird, take care of that.

Senator STENNIS. We will have to have that interpreted, Mr. Secretary. Can you explain to us what they are and how they are violated?

Mr. MARSH. I do not have the last set of regulations.

Senator STENNIS. You know them, generally?

Mr. MARSH. Generally speaking it is the same application of a safety distance around. They will prepare a table and say you must not load more than this or not load at this. The Coast Guard tell us where we may load explosives. For a long time explosives were loaded out of Perth Amboy. They tell us now we may not load it out of there any longer. They select the spots where we may do it with due consideration of the safety distances.

At Perth Amboy we are required to put it on barges and take it out in the Fairway and unload it.

Captain LAIRD. I can't add much more, as we use the Coast Guard regulations it is almost entirely how we shall handle the ammunition from the pier into the ship but more than the distances.

For the distances we use the Armed Forces safety board's regulations and criteria for distances from inhabited and improvement type structures.

Senator JACKSON. Are you in violation of those distances?

Captain LAIRD. Yes, sir, in the case of Port Chicago we are.

Mr. MARSH. Anything inside of that circle is in violation.

Senator JACKSON. Inside the circle as appears in this chart?

Mr. MARSH. That's right.

Senator JACKSON. So that actual land that is now being acquired and as requested by the Navy will only act as a bit of preventive medicine, that is to prevent people from coming in but nothing is being done to remove the people who are in the so-called target area?

Mr. MARSH. That's right.

Senator STENNIS. What do they say about it? What is their attitude, since you had this explosion out there? People get to a place and won't leave, regardless of the hazard?

Mr. MARSH. That is the trouble. The fact that no one was killed in Port Chicago is probably an added factor in that.

Senator JACKSON. When a disaster takes place, they have a right to change their minds. When the kinfolk file claims, the Government and the Congress openly and flagrantly in defiance of the hazard appropriated funds not to move people and acquire lands but to acquire vacant land.

General LASHER. With your permission I would like to state this. This is a very critical problem as far as the Army is concerned.

Approved For Release 2003/04/17 : CIA-RDP80-01370R000500060017-3  
536

During World War II we tried various places. This Bayonne terminal that the Secretary spoke about. We built it thinking it safe. Mayors Hague and LaGuardia appealed directly to the President, and we had to move down to a Navy facility at Earle, N. J.

We moved into places and out of places because of their dangerousness. We have not until this program of the Army has started with Sunny Point, Kings Bay, Potrero Hills, and Point aux Pines and others to follow have we had a real safe projected program for the Army.

I would also like to point out that shortly after World War II we were shipping ammonium nitrate as fertilizer to many areas all over the world. A shipload with ammonia nitrate blew up in Texas City. The claims amounted to \$550 million—and they are not all settled yet.

That will more than pay for all the \$35 million safe places like Potrero Hills that the Army has now projected.

I think that is very important. The tonnages that we ship, which we ship in shipload lots. If you are loading them more than one at a time, they must be separated by a thousand feet or more. By preventing this encroachment now, because our coastal lands are being built up tremendously fast, the land is becoming dearer each year, and here is a place 90 percent of which is in pasture, 18 percent in marsh, 2 percent only cultivated, we think this is the place on the west coast, and it is part and parcel of a plan which I think, if we had one disaster because we are in an unsafe place, we will be way ahead of the game by following this program.

Senator STENNIS. You don't propose to store ammunition at this new site?

Mr. MARSH. No, sir.

Senator STENNIS. You are going to bring it in by train or truck and then put it on ship and it is gone?

General LASHER. Yes, sir.

Senator STENNIS. Any other facts?

Captain LAIRD. With the Secretary's permission I would like to point out that approximately in this location there is a multimillion-dollar refinery in a little town called Avon, and any expansion in that direction would cause considerable difficulty with that.

Senator STENNIS. I believe we have the facts.

Unless there is something else you think of, we want to especially thank you for coming in.

Mr. DARDEN. There is one further item that Senator Jackson is interested in on the storage problem.

Senator JACKSON. All right.

(Whereupon at 11:15 a. m. the committee proceeded to further business.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

Present: Senators Stennis (presiding) and Case.

Also present: Allen W. Dulles, Director, Central Intelligence Agency; L. K. White, Deputy Director, CIA; Walter L. Pforzheimer, legislative counsel, CIA; and [redacted] CIA.

Staff members: William H. Darden and T. Edward Brazwell of the committee staff.

Senator STENNIS. You may proceed.

STATINTL

Mr. DULLES. We deeply appreciate the opportunity to appear before you this afternoon in support of our request for authority to provide a headquarters installation for the Central Intelligence Agency.

The authorization language to which we address ourselves is contained in title IV of S. 1765, the military construction bill, presently before your committee.

Title IV of this legislation would authorize the Director of Central Intelligence to construct the necessary headquarters building, facilities, appurtenances, utilities, and access roads at a cost of not to exceed \$50 million, and to acquire the necessary land at a cost of not to exceed \$6 million.

Our authorization request therefore amounts to a total of \$56 million.

This request for authorization has been included in the military construction bill as the Armed Services Committee has been our parent committee on matters of substantive legislation affecting the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Bureau of the Budget felt that this request would best be included in the bill presently before you."

There is no reason to conceal the fact that we need a headquarters installation, or that we are considering several sites for its location. These facts have appeared in the press.

It would seem to be unrealistic and a false concept of security to attempt to conceal either our need or the request for authorization.

A good deal of the testimony which we are furnishing in support of this authorization can certainly be made a matter of your public record.

However, I would appreciate the opportunity of discussing certain facets of our request on an off-the-record basis with this committee.

The Central Intelligence Agency is presently located in 34 separate buildings in the District of Columbia area. We have some charts.

Senator CASE. Mr. Chairman, do you want interrogation now or at the completion of the statement?

Senator STENNIS. Whichever you want.

Senator CASE. From the map it would appear that a large portion of the buildings are in these so-called tempo buildings. Do you know in terms of floor space what proportion of your facilities are housed in temporary buildings?

Mr. DULLES. We can give it to you promptly.

Mr. WHITE. There are 20 out of the 34 buildings that are temporary. That floor space is roughly 900,000 square feet.

Senator CASE. Out of how much do you occupy altogether?

Mr. WHITE. Out of a total at the moment 1,415,000 feet.

Senator CASE. That is, considerably more than 50 percent of your facilities are housed in temporary buildings, 900,000 out of 1,400,000 square feet?

Senator STENNIS. That is a strong point. If we pass this bill, we ought to put a proviso in there as these temporary buildings are vacated they should be taken down.

Mr. DULLES. In fact we are threatened with having them taken down almost before.

Senator CASE. May I follow that question up a moment? To what extent are the records or the data that are necessarily located where you have these temporary buildings, to what extent is that replaceable or irreplaceable?

Mr. DULLES. It is very largely irreplaceable. I was going to go into that. One of our great problems is the protection of all our records. We can't put them all in fireproof safes. That would be prohibitive.

Senator CASE. We have an idea what those temporary buildings are. I was wondering if it was possible in your operation to segregate the material that had a reasonably high degree of irreplacability from the others, but when you have that much of your space in these temporary buildings it seems harder to operate that way.

Mr. DULLES. The space in the temporary buildings is quite largely highly operative space.

Senator CASE. You can't put your diamonds in the window and put it in the safe overnight.

Mr. DULLES. We hope we have too many diamonds for that. This map indicates what the contemplated tunnel or bridge and the approaches and the new roadway system in that area would do to our present buildings.

You see how it cuts across our buildings and would make a good many of them unusable. There is strong pressure to get rid of the temporaries along the reflecting pool and the others.

I understand when they were built they were supposed to fall down in 4 or 5 years but they have hung on for 10, just as the temporaries from World War I are still with us.

Our buildings range from the administration building, where my own office is located at 24th and E Streets NW., behind the Heurich Co. brewery on Rock Creek Parkway, to a division, which is housed in a temporary building at 20th and Constitution Avenue NE., near the National Guard Armory.

The need for CIA to do something about a headquarters installation has been with us for several years now, but the problem has become increasingly urgent since we first discussed it with the Congress in 1951.

During this 4-year period we have made a series of attempts to find an adequate building in Washington which could house at least the bulk of our personnel. We have been unsuccessful.

The General Services Administration tell us that there is nothing adequate available, and that we must build.

Aside from the lack of available facilities, we feel a complete centralized installation tailored to our particular needs would pay for itself over a reasonable period of time, not only in improved security but in increased efficiency and economy of operations.

I would like to go into the security aspect for a moment.

That bothers us most in our present situation. Scattered as we are in these 34 buildings that keeps me awake at night when I consider the number of classified papers that have to be carried back and forth between these various buildings. Many thousands of classified documents are received in CIA each month. Many of these have to be passed around from one building to another. A good many of them are of the very highest of security classifications.

The loss of any one of these papers to a hostile country would have very serious repercussions on our national security.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator STENNIS. Back on the record.

Mr. DULLES. An additional security problem is the fire hazard in the keeping of our records and documents. The temps are highly

flammable and, even with the best sprinkler systems we could develop, it would be impossible to secure these records against fire and many are irreplaceable.

In connection with our telephone system, we estimate that we could save \$32,800 a year which is our annual mileage charge for trunklines between our present buildings if we had a central building.

I will go into other savings as we go along.

To cover our main buildings we have had to acquire and operate six agency shuttle buses.

Of course we will have to have 1 or 2 buses even if we have a central building to maintain contact with the Pentagon, and with the State Department and other agencies of Government.

But we think we would save \$36,000 a year by the elimination of the shuttle service.

The great loss is not in money for these buses and guards and so on, but it is the time factor.

If I want to see one of my top people at 5 o'clock at night when there is a lot of traffic, it takes him a half hour to get from his building to where I am and then another half hour to get back again.

The loss of time, I think, is the most serious element here.

This matter was considered by Congress in connection with the new building for the Atomic Energy Commission and they are scattered, I think, in only four buildings. They pointed out the seriousness of this to the Congress and I think that Congress recognized that.

I would like to put up this little chart which will show the precise savings that we think we would realize if we had one building.

(The document referred to is as follows:)

*One new building would save the taxpayer approximately \$2,920,000 annually*

Item	Present costs	Estimated costs in 1 new building	Estimated savings in 1 new building
Guard service.....	\$1,173,000	\$320,000	\$853,000
Reception staff.....	110,000	30,000	80,000
Shuttle service.....	36,800		36,800
Couriers and messengers.....	213,200	143,300	69,900
Telephone mileage charges.....	32,800		32,800
Building services officers.....	125,000	75,000	50,000
Rents.....	133,500		133,500
Alterations and moving.....	1,332,000	300,000	1,032,000
Loss of time.....	607,000		607,000
TWX service.....	45,000	20,000	25,000
Total.....	3,808,300	888,300	2,920,000

Mr. DULLES. The present cost of our guard service is \$1,173,000. Estimated cost in 1 building \$320,000, or a saving of \$853,000.

Then we have a reception staff having so many buildings, present cost \$110,000. Estimated cost in 1 building \$30,000.

Shuttle service is about \$36,000. Couriers and messengers between our buildings would be cut down from \$213,000 to \$143,000. The telephone mileage charges would disappear at a saving of \$32,000. On the building service officers, the saving would be \$50,000. Some of our buildings we rent for \$133,000. Alterations and moving costs have been very high because these buildings require changes and alterations all the time. We think we would save around a million dollars on that. There is a loss of time, purely estimated, \$607,000.

Senator STENNIS. This is based on actual figures except your loss of time?

Mr. WHITE. They are. They take into consideration no intangibles. In the loss of time I might add we have pulled that down pretty tight. That is based on the average time it takes to make a trip in a shuttle bus or by car.

Twenty minutes by car and thirty minutes by shuttle bus, based on the actual number of passengers that were carried. We did not take into consideration any time that they might have spent in getting ready to go, in locking their safes and what not.

Senator STENNIS. All right, you may proceed.

Mr. DULLES. The new building only allows for a slight expansion but we think it is adequate. I have been making every effort to keep these numbers down.

We have been working very closely with the GSA in the development of our building requirements.

(The document referred to is as follows:)

Cost

Building with gross floor area of 2,300,000 square feet; basement, 7 floors, reinforced concrete frame; pile foundations; air conditioning; fluorescent lighting; auditorium, shops, and laboratory areas; cafeteria included.

Estimate

Building (2,300,000 square feet at \$19.52 (approximate))-----	\$14,900,000
Elevators and escalators, air conditioning, steam connection, contingency, general expenses.	
Piles-----	1,260,000
Road and utilities changes-----	200,000
Stone facing, etc-----	1,500,000
Emergency generator-----	500,000
Special requirements-----	1,640,000
Total building cost-----	50,000,000
Site-----	6,000,000

Mr. DULLES. As you will see from this chart we are planning on a building to contain a total of 2,300,000 square feet of gross space.

In any building there is a certain amount of circulation and service space such as corridors, stairways, toilets, and so forth, which makes up the difference between net space and gross space.

We are asking for nothing but space in which we can operate securely and efficiently under one roof, and we shall neither recommend nor accept devices or fittings that exceed our requirements in this regard.

That chart there gives you a general idea of how the space is allocated.

In 1951 we sought authorization from your committee for a CIA headquarters building, and we were authorized the sum of \$38 million.

At that time the House Appropriations Committee did not authorize any funds for construction, but the funds were restored in the Senate appropriations bill.

However, there was a feeling that we had not at that time sufficiently canvassed the possibility of utilizing an existing building, nor had we progressed far enough in site selection or planning to warrant the expenditure of additional funds in that year.

As a result, the appropriations conferees denied us the funds to proceed.

It got caught in the last-minute rush. It got caught in the conferences between the Senate and House.

Senator STENNIS. What year was that?

Mr. DULLES. 1951. And it was cut out. We tried to struggle on as we were until this last year we reached the conclusion that we can't operate efficiently and properly without a building.

I want to refer briefly to the fact that we are asking today for \$50 million whereas we received authorization for only \$38 million in 1951, that is \$50 million for the building, \$6 million for the land.

Senator STENNIS. You would want this \$38 million revised; wouldn't you?

Mr. DULLES. We are suggesting that. It would be probably wiser to rescind it and start afresh.

The reason for the increase is attributable to two factors. One is a more realistic analysis of our space requirements which show that we need additional square feet over that which we planned for in 1951. That is due to increased duties that have been placed upon us and realistic planning I think for the future.

Secondly, it is due to the fact that construction costs have increased 17 percent from 1951 to the present time. In fact, that 17 percent increase would practically fill up the gap between the 38 and the 50.

We estimate that the final cost of construction would be approximately the same whether we build in the District of Columbia or outside.

In the former case, that is in the case of the District, we would have to have what is called a monumental building to conform to the District architecture.

That means a stone facing. However, if we are to build outside the District, we would have the cost of some utilities and interior roads within the property which would largely balance out the cost of a monumental structure in the District.

I may say that the item put in for land purchase would be very substantially reduced if we build outside the District. We are rather inclining to do that.

Mr. DULLES. That shows \$6 million for a site and a slightly different estimate as you will see for the cost of the building.

Senator CASE. How many acres does that contemplate? For the site?

Mr. DULLES. If we build outside the District where we have plenty of room we would want to buy a hundred acres. If we build inside the District we would build on a very much reduced area. We can get land relatively cheap outside the District.

Senator STENNIS. When you say outside, you contemplate going out how far?

Mr. DULLES. We contemplate going out not further than about 7 or 8 miles from the Capitol or the White House. I will come to that later on that particular point.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Secretary, if you want to include these charts in the record and just hit the high points we may do so. We may not have much time, as much as I anticipated. I am not hurrying you.

ILLEGIB

necessary, but you might have to wait here 20

ed the question of lease-purchase against di-  
rather inclined to favor the direct purchase  
rchange.

In regard to the Atomic Energy building we  
ession that the Lease-Purchase Act did not  
eadquarters buildings of this type but rather  
houses and so forth and so on.

over a period of the lease purchase plan is  
r.

total cost over the years would probably be  
That is just an estimate. We would have  
ease purchase period. And there are various  
make us feel that this cost would be greater.  
of an estimate because when you pay your

money later that, in a sense, is a saving, but we believe that the Gov-  
ernment would come off better by the direct payment rather than by  
the lease-purchase plan, for this particular type of operation.

Senator CASE. There is little doubt in my mind as to that point.

I would like to see that other chart if we might to compare those  
figures, that is the District city chart you have in front of us and now  
you are putting up the out of city chart.

(The chart referred to is as follows:)

ILLEGIB

Cost
Building with gross floor area of 2,300,000 square feet; basement, approximately 7 floors, reinforced concrete frame; air conditioning, fluorescent lighting; auditorium, shops, laboratory; and cafeteria included.

*Estimate*

Building (2,300,000 square feet, at \$19.03 approximately) .....	\$43,760,000
Elevators and escalators, air conditioning, contingency, general expenses.	
Boiler plant.....	2,700,000
Tunnel, boiler plant to building.....	200,000
Roads, parking, site development, and exterior utility changes.....	1,200,000
Emergency generator.....	500,000
Special requirements.....	1,640,000
 Total building cost.....	50,000,000
Site cost.....	1,000,000

Senator CASE. In either case it seems to me that that square-foot price is pretty high. Where did you get that figure?

Mr. WHITE. That was computed in conjunction with the Bureau of the Budget and the Public Building Service, sir. We were required by them to come within \$20 per square foot.

Senator CASE. Do you know how that compares with the cost of, let us say, the new State Department building?

Mr. DULLES. We have several of these buildings that we compared it to.

Senator STENNIS. How does it compare with the new Senate Office Building going over here?

Mr. WHITE. I believe it will be very much below that. I don't know what that cost is. There are three factors that enter into that cost, Senator, which I think should be considered.

The best advice we could get was that we could not expect a contract with these limitations of course placed in our specifications on less than about \$20 a square foot.

Senator CASE. I was surprised at your 7-mile figure in view of the fact that the Atomic Energy people said they have to get out about 35 miles.

Mr. WHITE. That State Department building which was built in 1939 was based on \$18.20 per square foot. If you project your increased cost since 1939, that building today would cost you about \$36 per square foot.

Senator CASE. What did the new General Accounting Office cost?

Mr. WHITE. I have a comparison of that, sir. We considered that with the Bureau of the Budget in arriving at our cost estimate. We did it in this way, sir. That building cost \$26,508,000. That was the actual cost in January 1949.

That is what they call a block-type building which is just a square building and is almost all open space, because they have lots of machinery and people who can work in open type space.

In our building we must have for security reasons a very high degree of compartmentation. The architects tell us where you have a high degree of compartmentation you cannot do with a block-type building. You get into air conditioning and heating problems.

Senator CASE. What did that figure out on a square foot basis?

Mr. WHITE. That is 1,894,000 square feet gross, whereas we are talking about 2,300,000 square feet. What we did was to adjust that, and this was done with the Bureau of Budget and PBS. We adjusted the cost of that building to an open-court type building which is what we think we must have.

That brought the cost up to a little over \$30 million. That is as of 1949. If you apply your increased cost factor from 1949 to now that same building today would cost \$39,157,000.

Then if you adjust the size using the same cost factors, but increase it from 1,894,000 to 2,300,000 square feet, that brings it up to almost \$48 million, and there are 2 items which we added to that which are peculiar to our building. One is an emergency generator because we feel we have to operate 24 hours a day no matter what happens. We have a half million dollars in for that and there are other special requirements, principally brought about by security conditions that total \$1,640,000.

But adding those 2 items which would total \$2,140,000, the cost considering increased construction costs is comparable in every respect to the GAO building.

Senator STENNIS. I am going to have to go. This is important and I will come back. But if you can briefly cover the main points and then come back with some of the details, maybe that will be better.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. DULLES. We feel we need this special type building and not the block-type because of the vital importance of compartmenting some highly sensitive parts of our work. About half of our work is as overt as the work of the State Department. The fact that we do it, the fact that we complete intelligence, and list intelligence and distribute it and so forth is known. There are many types of our work that we have to keep entirely secret and we will therefore have a

large wing of this building, maybe two which will be segregated from the rest of the building.

There has to be work back and forth and it is all under one control and direction, but we do keep our operations on a highly segregated basis.

I will try to run over some of the high points.

The original authorization in 1951 to which you referred was granted. We think you might wish to consider in case you act favorably on title IV, the repeal of the previous authorization.

We estimate that the project will take about 9 months for the preparation of the construction drawings and specifications and the award of the contract, and that it will take about an additional 2 years for construction.

That is one of the reasons why the matter is so urgent. We will try to cut down those periods as much as we can but we are likely to be thrown out of house and home within a 2-year period or a little more.

Senator STENNIS. These charts are going into the record because that unit cost and everything we want are all reflected in the record.

Mr. DULLES. You may wish to have a word about the suggested location of the building.

Senator STENNIS. Yes.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator STENNIS. You said something about the building a while ago. Did you say that an inside court—

Mr. WHITE. We have not specifically designed the building and felt we should not hire an architect to do so until we had made a site selection. That influences it.

But we were thinking of a court-type, or I believe in architectural terms a wing-type building. We were thinking in terms of a court or wing-type 7-story building.

Senator STENNIS. Let's have it in keeping with the good architecture of the city. I went over here to look at the proposed building for the Air Academy and frankly I was shocked and very much disappointed at this great modern entity, futuristic and scientific glass steel and so forth. It did not have a bit of the Western atmosphere, not native stone or anything.

Mr. DULLES. When we were considering our building some time ago, they wanted to make a building without any windows. I said I would not have a building without any windows. I wanted to look out. That is not for me. I am too old-fashioned for that.

Senator STENNIS. Let's proceed on any other point, Mr. Director?  
(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. DULLES. That completes what I had to say unless there are further questions.

Senator STENNIS. I don't have any further questions myself. Do you have any, Mr. Clerk?

Mr. BRASWELL. I don't have any. With respect to that dispersal, Senator Stennis, there is another little subcommittee, civil defense subcommittee, which is emphasizing that I think from the standpoint of this committee they would need the simple assurance that wherever the building is located it would be consistent with security requirements so you can assure them that it meets that problem insofar as dispersal is concerned.

Senator STENNIS. Except as to distance?

Mr. BRASWELL. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. My letter to Mr. Flemming of November 16, 1954, and Mr. Flemming's reply in which he said:

As a result of the consultations we have had and also as a result of the discussions at a recent meeting of the Cabinet, we are willing to concur in the exception to current dispersion standards which you recommended in your letter of November 16.

In concurring in this exception I hope, however, you will give consideration to the possibility of locating a portion of your Agency at an emergency relocation site. We will be more than happy to discuss such a possibility with you.

I will give you those letters.

NOVEMBER 16, 1954.

Hon. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,  
*Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington 25, D. C.*

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: Office space in Washington, D. C., for the Central Intelligence Agency, is located in more than 30 separate buildings, most of which are temporary structures. The security problems, inefficiency, and excessive costs inherent in this situation have long indicated the high desirability of providing space for the Central Intelligence Agency in Washington in one permanent building.

Construction of the recently approved highway bridge across the Potomac River with its approaches just west of Memorial Bridge will necessitate the destruction of a large portion of the buildings now occupied by this Agency.

Additional buildings are scheduled for demolition when the Secretary of the Interior starts the proposed project to clear the park area of temporary structures. I, therefore, consider it essential that plans be made without delay for the construction of permanent headquarters facilities for the Central Intelligence Agency in the Washington area.

I am cognizant of the fact that current dispersion standards for new construction of Government buildings require such buildings to be located 10 or more miles from the perimeter of an urban target unless the nature of the activity for which the facility is to be used will not permit the use of a dispersed location. However, after careful consideration I have concluded that the Central Intelligence Agency could not effectively accomplish its mission from such a dispersed location. It is essential that the Director be immediately available to the President and the National Security Council. There are also an estimated 50 to 100 of CIA's senior staff who must be in close, daily contact with personnel of other agencies, particularly the Departments of State and Defense, and who must also be immediately available to the Director, as well as to those components of the Agency under their supervision and upon which they are dependent for support. In my judgment the necessity for such close and expeditious coordination within the Central Intelligence Agency and the intelligence community dictates that the entire agency be at one location not more than a few miles distance from the White House.

The General Services Administration has suggested, and we are currently considering, several federally owned properties at distances varying from 5 to 10 miles from the White House which appear to be suitable for the construction of a headquarters building to meet our needs. In order that we may proceed with the final selection of a site and request the formal approval of the President and the Congress for the construction your concurrence is requested in an exception to current dispersion standards for a proposed new headquarters building for the Central Intelligence Agency.

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN W. DULLES, *Director.*

Senator STENNIS. I appreciate the chance to hear you gentlemen. I don't have any questions left in my mind.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. DULLES. We are primarily a service agency in the sense that we work with and for the policymaking agencies of Government. We work with Defense and then with the State Department and with the other members of the National Security Council, with FOA and various of the other members of the National Security Council.

Our people are going back and forth between the Pentagon and our headquarters and the State Department and our headquarters, the National Security Council meetings Planning Board meetings, meetings of OCB. Our people are on a great many committees composed of State, Defense, CIA, FOA, and others.

It would be almost impossible, if not impossible, for us to carry out those duties if we were at a distance of say, 40 to 50 miles from the center of Government.

Senator CASE. I recognize the points that you are making but I think that the average individual would regard your work as more sensitive, more important to preserve, than some other activities, where their activities can be restored. I am just wondering upon the effect on other agencies when dispersal is suggested to them if they can point to your agency and say you built a new building for the CIA and put it there right inside the critical area.

Mr. DULLES. We expect to locate at some distance from the center of the critical area. I grant you that from the point of view of dispersal, from the point of view of fall-out, hydrogen bomb, we are not protected. However, we believe that even under those conditions, where we expect to locate we could protect our sensitive documents and we could probably get a great number of our people into areas of relative safety.

Senator CASE. Of course it is hard to say what is the critical area. You can take a map and draw a circle on the map and assume that the center of a circle is a particular sensitive or critical area or the heart of it, but when you use atomic or hydrogen weapons, a miss is as good as a hit and there is no guaranty that a bomb is going to drop at the pinpointed center of any circle.

Mr. DULLES. That is correct. Even if you were dispersed you might still be in an area of danger. This particular matter was considered at the Cabinet level and I made a presentation before the Cabinet some months ago. Following that, I wrote a letter to Dr. Flemming and I received his reply and both of these letters I will put into the record.

That was the letter that Dr. Flemming wrote me.

Senator CASE. That has already been placed in the record?

Mr. DULLES. Yes.

Senator CASE. Did you give any consideration to the possibility of 2 buildings, having 1 building which would be near enough to make ready contact with the other agencies located in the heart of the District of Columbia and then a possibly larger building considerably removed?

Mr. DULLES. We did, sir. That is extremely difficult. We are really suffering under that situation in a modest way at the present time.

Your problem is this. Let me take a precise example.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator CASE. During World War II we had a number of agencies that were moved to Philadelphia, Chicago, and other points with the agency retaining a skeleton organization in the District.

Of course, there, I think, one consideration was the matter of space facilities. We were not contemplating at all at that time dispersal from the standpoint of dealing with a weapon of an obliterating nature.

I personally think that you are inviting trouble at site 6.

Mr. DULLES. May I just deal with the basic thought you have expressed. During World War II, I don't think it was suggested at any time that our predecessor agency, that is the Office of Strategic Services, should move away from the central contact with the Pentagon very largely at that time, to some extent with State and other agencies. Particularly in wartime, we are far more closely integrated into the military structure than we are today.

That requires the closest integration with the military services.

Senator CASE. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Senator CASE. Let's go back on the record.

Of course when we talk to the problem of dispersal, when we get to any particular agency we have the same psychology operating that sometimes operates when you are talking about a cutting down of an appropriation. It is not our agency that can be reduced or dispersed, it is the other agency that it should be done to.

For us there is a special reason why it shouldn't be applied to us.

Just thinking in terms of congressional psychology and public opinion, I don't believe that this committee will be able to speak effectively about dispersion about anybody or congestion to anybody if we give our approval to a \$50 million program that seems to add to congestion or to run in the face of the principle of dispersion.

Mr. DULLES. On the basis of congestion, Senator, we hope to find one of these sites we have described to you, which would very largely meet the points of congestion.

When it comes to dispersal, I don't think anything much would be served by attempting to start with this particular agency, which as I said before is a service agency working with the Pentagon, the State Department as well as with the members of the Security Council.

We cannot work without them; we cannot work without constant daily contact not only between the top people in the Agency but between those that are working on the various desks that deal with problems in countries throughout the world, and have to deal with those in the light of decisions being made currently at the State Department and in the Pentagon. I just don't feel that the work of the Central Intelligence Agency can efficiently be carried out at a distance of 30 or 40 miles or an hour and a half or 2 hours from the essential people with whom not only I myself but hundreds of people in the Agency have to work on practically an hourly basis throughout the days and months.

Mr. WHITE. And they can't do it by telephone.

Senator CASE. The incident which would sometime call for dispersal may never come. That is, it may never be actually an attack upon Washington. On the other hand, of course, there can be. The congestion is a certainty. If we never have a war, we are going to be fighting the problem of congestion if you locate where you either add to or go in the midst of possible congestion.

Mr. DULLES. Yes, but I think if we take either of these alternative sites we have discussed, we would tend to eliminate from the District a certain amount of the congestion which we are today bringing to the District in our location there as we have pointed out today.

Therefore there would be a net improvement rather than a net loss.

Senator CASE. I have spent some time both in the Committee on Public Works and in the Senate District Committee on studying the traffic flow with particular reference to the bridges on the Potomac. Anything that would mean the movement of employees through the central part of Washington and across any of the central bridges would be adding to the problem of congestion and in view of what has been said as to where most of your employees live, it seems to me that the fact of congestion ought to be considered and not merely the hypothetical possibility of what you do in case of an attack.

You face the problem of congestion every evening and every morning and if you happen to have a good rain at the right time, a good rain or a snowstorm, any time you try to move a number of employees through the central bridges on the Potomac your own people are going to have trouble and you will add to the troubles of other people.

I don't care to argue the point at a hearing but I raise the points because they will be raised by the Congress.

I notice you had consulted the Public Buildings Service in working up your plans. Would they be expected to supervise the construction?

Mr. WHITE. We had expected to work with the Public Buildings Service in this, sir. We had prepared all our plans with them and plan to select an architect with them and work with them jointly in letting our bids although the language of the appropriation is intended to appropriate the funds to us.

Senator CASE. The language does. It places the authorization in you. Has any consideration been given in placing the actual construction with the Public Buildings Service or the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. DULLES. We had not expected to place it with the Corps of Engineers, sir. We had expected to do it in conjunction with the Public Buildings Service. We plan to work it with them and not with the Corps of Engineers.

Senator CASE. Have you been building any buildings?

Mr. DULLES. No, sir; we have not.

Senator CASE. Do you have a division, an architectural division, or an engineering division?

Mr. DULLES. We have a small construction division.

Senator CASE. Do you have an engineering organization that would be adequate to take on something of this magnitude?

Mr. DULLES. No, sir; we do not. We would have to and expect to lean on the Public Buildings Service for that assistance.

Senator CASE. In the Public Works Committee in discussing a highway program or any other program, one of the first things we run into is this question: Are engineers available? Can you get technical staff to supervise or to lay out this construction program? I think it might be desirable for the committee to consider that problem.

You might give it some thought and give us a mature recommendation on that. I would hesitate to see the committee take action that would have the Central Intelligence Agency set up a large construction agency.

Mr. DULLES. We would not do that. We would not want to.

Mr. WHITE. We have no thought of that at all.

Senator CASE. I am not entirely enamored of putting all Government construction in one agency, but I think that where an agency has only 1 or 2 construction projects that it is much better for them to have it handled through a central construction agency.

If you have an agency like the Department of Defense with a great deal of construction in each of its subdepartments, I think you can argue that Army or Navy or Air Force might have a construction agency because they are large enough to have enough going on at all times to maintain a considerable staff with experienced and competent people.

But if they were agencies which only once in a lifetime or once in 50 years had a major construction project, it seems to me better to have that serviced by a central construction agency.

I think purely from a construction angle—there, again, I think that is a matter I shall want the committee in its executive session to consider.

Mr. DULLES. We will work on that.

Senator CASE. I think that completes the questions I had.

Thank you very much.

(Whereupon at 4 p. m. the committee adjourned the hearing.)